arXiv:1610.00241v1 [hep-th] 2 Oct 2016

Special Gravity as Alternatives for Interacting Massless Gravitons

Dong BAI* and Yu-Hang XING†

Key Laboratory of Theoretical Physics,

Institute of Theoretical Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China

School of Physical Sciences, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences,

No.19A Yuquan Road, Beijing 100049, China

Abstract

Special gravity, first discussed by Wald [1] decades ago, is a novel class of theories for interacting massless gravitons in Minkowski spacetime. It respects gauge invariance, but not general covariance, which is drastically different from Einstein's gravity and many of its modifications. In this note, we study properties of special gravity, revealing its connections with asymptotic causality, S-matrix program, non-renormalization, massive gravity and emergent gravitons in condensed matter systems.

Introduction

Massless gravitons take the central position in theoretical physics. The most well-known theories for interacting massless gravitons are Einstein's gravity and its modifications such as $f(R)$ theory, Gauss-Bonnet theory, etc. All these theories are invariant under general coordinate transformations and enjoy the unusual property of background independence. It was first noted by Wald in the 1980s [1] that not all the consistent theories for interacting massless gravitons are generally covariant. There is indeed a novel class of theories on Minkowski spacetime which is invariant under "only" gauge transformations[1]

$$h_{\mu\nu} \to h_{\mu\nu} + \partial_\mu \xi_\nu + \partial_\nu \xi_\mu, \tag{1}$$

*Electronic address: dbai@itp.ac.cn

†Electronic address: xingyh@itp.ac.cn

[1]Be cautious! In this note, "gauge transformations" is reserved for Eq. (1), while Eq. (2) is referred to as "general coordinate transformations."

rather than general coordinate transformations

$$h_{\mu\nu} \to h_{\mu\nu} + \partial_\mu \xi_\nu + \partial_\nu \xi_\mu + \partial_\mu \xi^\rho \partial_\nu \xi_\rho + h_{\rho\nu} \partial_\mu \xi^\rho + h_{\mu\rho} \partial_\nu \xi^\rho + h_{\rho\sigma} \partial_\mu \xi^\rho \partial_\nu \xi^\sigma, \qquad (2)$$

where ξ_μ is the finite transformation parameter. As proved by Wald, the latter is the unique non-linear completion of the former. The two are essentially different from each other in the following sense:

1. Gauge transformations are linear, abelian transformations, while general coordinate transformations are nonlinear, nonabelian transformations;

2. Gauge transformations are *pointwise* transformations, while general coordinate transformations "move points."

For later convenience, gravity theories invariant under gauge transformations will be called *special gravity*, as they respect special relativity only. The most amazing property of special gravity is that it is defined exactly on Minkowski spacetime. There is no need for the notion of curved spacetime, which is drastically different from Einstein's gravity. Also, there could be local observables in special gravity, whereas they are forbidden by general covariance in Einstein's gravity. In other words, special gravity looks more like the traditional field theories such as Maxwell's theory and Yang-Mills theory, compared to Einstein's gravity.

Although studied by various authors from different starting points [1–9], it is fair to say that physical properties of special gravity are less known, especially the field-theoretic properties, such as scattering amplitudes. It is the main purpose of this note to take the first step to fulfill this gap.

Lagrangians

In this section, we would like to construct Lagrangians for special gravity. The kinematic terms for massless gravitons in dimensions $D \geq 4$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned} S^{(2)} &= \int \mathrm{d}^D x \left(\sqrt{-g}R\right)^{(2)} \\ &= \int \mathrm{d}^D x \left(\frac{1}{2} h^{\mu\nu} \partial_\rho \partial^\rho h_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} h^\mu_\mu \partial_\rho \partial^\rho h^\nu_\nu - h^{\mu\nu} \partial_\rho \partial_\nu h^\rho_\mu + h^\mu_\mu \partial_\rho \partial_\nu h^{\nu\rho} \right), \end{aligned} \qquad (3)$$

which is well-known to be invariant under gauge transformations. $\left(\sqrt{-g}R\right)^{(2)}$ in the first line is used only as a shorthand, this is by no means to say that our discussions have anything indispensable to do with curved spacetime.

Since $S^{(2)}$ describes free gravitons only, extra vertices are needed to make the resulting theory nontrivial. For this article we deal mainly with three-point vertices of the *pure* special gravity. It is pointed out explicitly by Ref. [10] that in dimensions

$D \geq 4$, there are only three types of parity-preserving *on-shell* three-point amplitudes for massless gravitons:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}_2^{(3)} &= (\epsilon_1.\epsilon_2\, \epsilon_3.p_1 + \epsilon_1.\epsilon_3\, \epsilon_2.p_3 + \epsilon_2.\epsilon_3\, \epsilon_1.p_2)^2, \\
\mathcal{A}_4^{(3)} &= (\epsilon_1.\epsilon_2\, \epsilon_3.p_1 + \epsilon_1.\epsilon_3\, \epsilon_2.p_3 + \epsilon_2.\epsilon_3\, \epsilon_1.p_2)\epsilon_1.p_2\, \epsilon_2.p_3\, \epsilon_3.p_1, \\
\mathcal{A}_6^{(3)} &= (\epsilon_1.p_2\, \epsilon_2.p_3\, \epsilon_3.p_1)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Here we have used the replacement rule $\epsilon_{\mu\nu} \to \epsilon_\mu \epsilon_\nu$ for massless gravitons. The subscripts "2", "4", "6" denote the numbers of momenta in these three amplitudes. Among the three, $\mathcal{A}_2^{(3)}$ corresponds to the three-point amplitude in Einstein's gravity, and $\mathcal{A}_4^{(3)}$ actually vanishes in $D = 4$ for reasons to be cleared later on. Then the most general three-point amplitude is given by a linear combination of the above three amplitudes

$$\mathcal{A}_{hhh}^{(3)} = \alpha_2 \mathcal{A}_2^{(3)} + \alpha_4 \mathcal{A}_4^{(3)} + \alpha_6 \mathcal{A}_6^{(3)}.$$

Usually, α_2 is normalized to be 1, i.e., the three-point amplitude of Einstein's gravity is conventionally taken to be non-vanishing. This motivates us to figure out *whether this is indispensable*. The answer turns out to be NO, and is closely related to special gravity.

The main results of this section are presented as follows:

Main Result 1. *In special gravity, there is no dimensional independent, three-point vertex giving rise to the on-shell three-point amplitude* $\mathcal{A}_2^{(3)}$*, while preserving gauge symmetry.*

In other words, $\mathcal{A}_2^{(3)}$ is unique for Einstein's gravity and its general covariant modifications.

Main Result 2. *In special gravity, the only dimensional independent, three-point vertices giving rise to the on-shell three-point amplitude* $\mathcal{A}_4^{(3)}$ *are given by*

$$S_4^{(3)} = \int \mathrm{d}^D x\ \delta^{\mu_1\nu_1\mu_2\nu_2 a}_{\rho_1\sigma_1\rho_2\sigma_2 b}\ h^b_a \partial_{\mu_1}\partial^{\rho_1} h^{\sigma_1}_{\nu_1} \partial_{\mu_2}\partial^{\rho_2} h^{\sigma_2}_{\nu_2}, \tag{4}$$

which is exactly the cubic order expansion in $h_{\mu\nu}$ of the Gauss-Bonnet term $\sim \sqrt{-g}(R^2 - 4R^{\mu\nu}R_{\mu\nu} + R^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}R_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma})$. A formal demonstration of why such expansions are gauge invariant is provided in the Appendix.

Main Result 3. *In special gravity, choosing the proper basis the only dimensional independent, three-point vertices giving rise to the on-shell three-point amplitude* $\mathcal{A}_6^{(3)}$ *could be given by*

$$S_6^{(3)} = \int \mathrm{d}^D x R^{(1)\mu\nu}{}_{\alpha\beta} R^{(1)\alpha\beta}{}_{\rho\sigma} R^{(1)\rho\sigma}{}_{\mu\nu}, \tag{5}$$

where $R^{(1)}_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \equiv -\frac{1}{2}\partial_\rho\partial_\mu h_{\nu\sigma} + \frac{1}{2}\partial_\rho\partial_\nu h_{\mu\sigma} + \frac{1}{2}\partial_\sigma\partial_\mu h_{\nu\rho} - \frac{1}{2}\partial_\sigma\partial_\nu h_{\mu\rho}$*, and indices are raised up by* $\eta^{\mu\nu}$ *rather than* $g^{\mu\nu}$*.*

The above results are obtained in a brute-force way using Mathematica. Take Main Result 1 as an example. There we start with linear combinations of all possible scalar contractions of three $h_{\mu\nu}$s and two derivatives ∂_μs, along with various free coefficients. The resulting expression is then required to be invariant under gauge transformations up to total derivatives, which imposes several conditions upon the free coefficients. For three $h_{\mu\nu}$s and two ∂_μs, no consistent choice of these free coefficients is found. Thus we have Main Result 1. Similarly, Main Result 2 and 3 could be obtained by redoing the analysis for three $h_{\mu\nu}$s and four ∂_μs and three $h_{\mu\nu}$s and six ∂_μs respectively.

Three remarks on technical details:

1. When constructing and simplifying various tensorial expressions, we haven't taken into considerations any dimensional dependent quantities such as those associated with Levi-Civita symbol $\varepsilon_{\mu_1\cdots\mu_D}$. This is exactly what "dimensional independent" would like to convey in the statements of Main Results;

2. Our Main Results are characterized by both "existence" and "uniqueness" of gauge invariant three-point vertices. In Main Result 2 and 3, various curved-spacetime notations are introduced to save space. Although the existence of gauge invariant three-point vertices could indeed be understood from the curved-spacetime viewpoints, such an understanding is not indispensable in our brute-force treatments, and it is somehow surprising that this is possible. Also, it is not clear to us yet how the "uniqueness" could be obtained from the curved-spacetime viewpoints;

3. For three $h_{\mu\nu}$s and four ∂_μs, the only gauge invariant, three-point vertices are given by Eq. (4), which give rise to $\mathcal{A}_4^{(3)}$ exactly. On the other hand, for three $h_{\mu\nu}$s and six ∂_μs, we have various choices for gauge invariant, three-point vertices. In fact, as $R^{(1)}_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$ and all its contractions turn out to be *exactly* gauge invariant, all their cubic scalar contractions are gauge invariant as well. However, not all these three-point vertices give rise to $\mathcal{A}_6^{(3)}$. For instance, three-point vertices given by $\left(R^{(1)}\right)^3$ are indeed gauge invariant, but lead to vanishing on-shell three-point amplitudes. The three-point vertices giving rise to $\mathcal{A}_6^{(3)}$ are scalar cubic contractions made of solely $R^{(1)}_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$s, among which only two are linearly independent. A convenient basis could be $I_1 \equiv R^{(1)\mu\nu}{}_{\alpha\beta}R^{(1)\alpha\beta}{}_{\rho\sigma}R^{(1)\rho\sigma}{}_{\mu\nu}$ and $G_3 \equiv I_1 - 2R^{(1)}{}_{\mu}{}^{\alpha}{}_{\rho}{}^{\beta}R^{(1)\mu\nu\rho\sigma}R^{(1)}_{\nu\alpha\sigma\beta}$. It is straightforward to show that the on-shell three-point amplitude given by G_3 actually vanishes, which agrees with Ref. [11]. Thus, it is in this basis that only I_1 gives rise to $\mathcal{A}_6^{(3)}$, as shown in Main Result 3.

The brute-force treatments could be "easily" generalized to n-point vertices, at the expense of inflating computation time. Examples of gauge invariant n-point vertices involve the n-point vertices of $(n-1)$-th Lovelock terms[2] (see Appendix), and scalar

[2] n-point vertices from Lovelock terms are invariant up to total derivatives under gauge transformation. $n = 2$ corresponds to the kinematic terms $S^{(2)}$, and $n = 3$ corresponds to the three-point

contractions of n copies of $R^{(1)}_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$, $R^{(1)}_{\mu\nu}$ or $R^{(1)}$. It is not clear yet whether there are extra contributions to gauge invariant n-point vertices, and it is interesting to work out some proofs for uniqueness. In fact, if additionally we require non-existence of classical (Ostrogradski) ghosts, a proof could be done similar to the famous proof given by Lovelock for his theory [12, 13]. The corresponding unique theory would consist only of pseudo-linear (next-to-leading order) terms resulting from every Euler Invariant, namely $(\sqrt{-g}R)^{(2)}$, $(\sqrt{-g}\mathcal{L}_{\rm GB})^{(3)}$ and all the $(\sqrt{-g}\mathcal{L}_{\text{n-th Lovelock}})^{(n+1)}$.

Up to now, we consider only pure special gravity. One way to couple special gravitons to matter is to simply construct scalar contractions out of $R^{(1)}_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$s and various matter fields, as well as spacetime derivatives ∂_μs. For example, the coupling of special gravitons to photons could be introduced by $R^{(1)}_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}F^{\mu\nu}F^{\rho\sigma}$.

Asymptotic Causality

Loosely speaking, principle of asymptotic causality states that *interactions always slow you down*. Applications of this principle range from the fact that light travels faster in vacuum than in glass, familiar to ten-year-old kids, to the celebrating Shapiro time delay [14], the 4th test of Einstein's gravity. See also Ref. [15] for a rigorous treatment of asymptotic causality in Einstein's gravity. Recently, asymptotic causality has been used to study R^2 and R^3 modifications of Einstein's gravity [10]. In this section we would like to use the same techniques to study the $S_4^{(3)}$ and $S_6^{(3)}$ theory[3].

Asymptotic causality of a target theory could be captured by

$$\delta(\vec{b},s)\equiv\frac{1}{2s}\int\frac{\mathrm{d}^{D-2}\vec{q}}{(2\pi)^{D-2}}e^{i\vec{q}.\vec{b}}\mathcal{A}_4(\vec{q}),\tag{6}$$

where $\mathcal{A}_4(\vec{q})$ is a shorthand for the tree-level four-point amplitude evaluated in the following momentum and polarization-vector configurations:[4]

$$p_{1\mu}=\left(p_u,\,\frac{q^2}{16p_u},\,\frac{\vec{q}}{2}\right),\qquad p_{2\mu}=\left(\frac{q^2}{16p_v},\,p_v,\,-\frac{\vec{q}}{2}\right),$$

$$p_{3\mu}=-\left(p_u,\,\frac{q^2}{16p_u},\,-\frac{\vec{q}}{2}\right),\qquad p_{4\mu}=-\left(\frac{q^2}{16p_v},\,p_v,\,\frac{\vec{q}}{2}\right),$$

vertices $S_4^{(3)}$. The characteristic property of these vertices is that they give rise to only second-order equations of motion, and thus are ghost-free.

[3]In this note, by special gravity we refer to all gravity theories invariant under gauge transformations. Specific theories of special gravity are referred to by their vertices. For example, by the $S_4^{(3)}$ theory we mean the specific special gravity theory whose vertices are given by $S_4^{(3)}$. Similar for the $S_6^{(3)}$ and S_{Λ_3} theory.

[4]In this section, following Ref. [10] we adopt the light-cone coordinate $ds^2=-dudv+\sum_{i=1}^{D-2}(dx_i)^2$. And $\vec{q}$ denotes transverse momentum, $\vec{e}_i$ denotes transverse polarizations, $\vec{b}$ denotes transverse displacement.

$$\epsilon^{1\mu} = \left(-\frac{\vec{q}.\vec{e}_1}{2p_u},\, 0,\, \vec{e}_1\right), \qquad \epsilon^{3\mu} = \left(\frac{\vec{q}.\vec{e}_3}{2p_u},\, 0,\, \vec{e}_3\right),$$

$$\epsilon^{2\mu} = \left(0,\, \frac{\vec{q}.\vec{e}_2}{2p_v},\, \vec{e}_2\right), \qquad \epsilon^{4\mu} = \left(0,\, -\frac{\vec{q}.\vec{e}_4}{2p_v},\, \vec{e}_4\right),$$

with $s \approx 4p_u p_v$ and $t \approx -(\vec{q})^2$. The external momenta are chosen in such a way that $s \gg t$, but s small enough such that the target theory is still weakly coupled. The polarization tensors for massless gravitons can be obtained by products of polarization vectors $\epsilon_{\mu\nu} = \epsilon_\mu \epsilon_\nu$. Principle of asymptotic causality then requires that $\delta(\vec{b}, s) \geq 0$ for *all* possible $\vec{b}$ and $\vec{e}_i$ choices.

Using on-shell methods [10], $\delta(\vec{b}, s)$ could be calculated as follows:

$$\delta(\vec{b}, s) = \begin{cases} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{D-4}{2})}{4\pi^{\frac{D-2}{2}}} \sum\limits_I \frac{\mathcal{A}^{(3)}_{13I}(-i\partial_{\vec{b}})\mathcal{A}^{(3)}_{I24}(-i\partial_{\vec{b}})}{2s} \frac{1}{|\vec{b}|^{D-4}}, & (D > 4) \\ \\ \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum\limits_I \frac{\mathcal{A}^{(3)}_{13I}(-i\partial_{\vec{b}})\mathcal{A}^{(3)}_{I24}(-i\partial_{\vec{b}})}{2s} (-\log|\vec{b}|), & (D = 4) \end{cases} \tag{7}$$

where $\mathcal{A}^{(3)}_{13I}(-i\partial_{\vec{b}})$ and $\mathcal{A}^{(3)}_{I24}(-i\partial_{\vec{b}})$ are related to on-shell three-point amplitudes, whose expressions are model-dependent. For $S_4^{(3)}$ and $S_6^{(3)}$, we have

$$S_4^{(3)}: \quad \sum_I \mathcal{A}^{(3)}_{13I}(-i\partial_{\vec{b}})\mathcal{A}^{(3)}_{I24}(-i\partial_{\vec{b}}) = s^2 e_1^{ij} e_3^{ik} e_2^{lm} e_4^{ln} \partial_{b^j}\partial_{b^k}\partial_{b^m}\partial_{b^n}, \tag{8}$$

$$S_6^{(3)}: \quad \sum_I \mathcal{A}^{(3)}_{13I}(-i\partial_{\vec{b}})\mathcal{A}^{(3)}_{I24}(-i\partial_{\vec{b}}) = s^2 e_1^{ij} e_3^{kl} e_2^{mn} e_4^{pq} \partial_{b^i}\partial_{b^j}\partial_{b^k}\partial_{b^l}\partial_{b^m}\partial_{b^n}\partial_{b^p}\partial_{b^q}, \tag{9}$$

respectively.

In the rest parts of this section, we would like to show that the $S_4^{(3)}$ and $S_6^{(4)}$ theory violate asymptotic causality, in much the same way that the R^2 and R^3 modification of Einstein's gravity would violate asymptotic causality as shown in Ref. [10]!

To see asymptotic causality violation for the $S_4^{(3)}$ theory, we could take the following choice of $\vec{b}$ and $\vec{e}_i$:

$$\vec{e}_3 = \vec{e}_1, \quad \vec{e}_4 = \vec{e}_2, \quad e_{1xy} = e_{1yx} = 1, \quad e_{2yz} = e_{2zy} = 1, \quad \vec{b} = (b, 0, \cdots, 0). \tag{10}$$

Take (8) and (10) back to Eq. (7), we have

$$\delta_4(\vec{b}, s) = \begin{cases} -\frac{\Gamma(\frac{D-4}{2})s}{4\pi^{\frac{D-2}{2}} b^D}(D-4)(D-3)(D-2) < 0, & (D > 4) \\ \\ -\frac{s}{\pi b^4} < 0, & (D = 4) \end{cases}$$

which contradicts the requirement of asymptotic causality $\delta(\vec{b}, s) \geq 0$.

Similarly, for the $S_6^{(3)}$ theory we could take the following choice of $\vec{b}$ and $\vec{e}_i$:

$$\vec{e}_3 = \vec{e}_1, \quad \vec{e}_4 = \vec{e}_2, \quad e_{1xx} = -e_{1yy} = 1, \quad e_{2xy} = e_{2yx} = 1, \quad \vec{b} = (b, 0, \cdots, 0). \tag{11}$$

Take (9) and (11) back to Eq. (7), we have

$$\delta_6(\vec{b}, s) = \begin{cases} -\frac{\Gamma(\frac{D-4}{2})s}{2\pi^{\frac{D-2}{2}} b^{D+4}}(D-4)(D-2)D(D+2)(D+3)(D^2+6D+20) < 0, \ (D>4) \\ \\ -\frac{s}{4\pi}\frac{80640}{b^8} < 0, \quad (D=4) \end{cases}$$

which contradicts the requirement of asymptotic causality $\delta(\vec{b}, s) \geq 0$.

The above results could be interpreted from both "pessimistic" and "optimistic" viewpoints as follows:

1. *Pure* special gravity with non-vanishing on-shell three-point amplitudes $\mathcal{A}_4^{(3)}$ and $\mathcal{A}_6^{(3)}$ is actually *inconsistent* with principle of asymptotic causality. In other words, asymptotic causality singles out Einstein's gravity and many of its general covariant modifications as the only legitimate theories for pure gravity theories with non-vanishing on-shell three-point amplitudes. This result could be viewed as a valuable complement to various "proofs" of the uniqueness of Einstein's gravity from the viewpoint of graviton dynamics [16–19];

2. One naive approach to avoid constraints from asymptotic causality could be requiring no $S_4^{(3)}$ or $S_6^{(3)}$ vertices in special gravity. Even in this case, special gravitons could interact with each other through either higher-point vertices, or three-point vertices that do not contribute to $\mathcal{A}_4^{(3)}$ or $\mathcal{A}_6^{(3)}$, say, $\left(R^{(1)}\right)^3$, which makes only *off-shell* contributions to higher-point amplitudes;

3. A sophisticated solution could be adding an infinite number of massive higher spin (> 2) particles, as argued by Ref. [10]. In this case, the $S_4^{(3)}$ and $S_6^{(3)}$ theory could be used to describe the massless sector of the full theory;

4. A radical possibility could be that special gravity may provide an effective description for dynamics of emergent gravitons in condensed matter systems. If this is the case, the violation of asymptotic causality could simply be a reflection of the lack of the notion of relativistic causality in underlying non-relativistic condensed matter systems.

Scattering Amplitudes

In this section, we shall study scattering amplitudes in special gravity, which are largely ignored by previous studies. We shall consider scattering amplitudes in $D = 4$ only, as the results could be largely simplified using spinor-helicity formalism.

For the $S_4^{(3)}$ theory, the three-point amplitude $\mathcal{A}_4^{(3)}$ could be written as

$$\mathcal{A}_4^{(3)} = \mathcal{A}_{\rm YM}^{(3)} \times \mathcal{A}_{\rm SS}^{(3)}.$$

Here, $\mathcal{A}_{\rm YM}^{(3)}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{\rm SS}^{(3)}$ are on-shell three-point amplitudes of Yang-Mills and Scherk-Schwarz theory respectively. Here by Scherk-Schwarz theory, we refer to the theory described by

$$S_{SS} = \int \mathrm{d}^D x \left[-\frac{1}{4}\mathrm{Tr}(F^\nu_\mu F^\mu_\nu) + \mathrm{Tr}(F^\nu_\mu F^\rho_\nu F^\mu_\rho) \right], \tag{12}$$

with $F_{\mu\nu} \equiv F^a_{\mu\nu} T^a$ as the field strength, and $F^a_{\mu\nu} \equiv \partial_\mu A^a_\nu - \partial_\nu A^a_\mu$. For simplicity, the coupling constant is set to be 1. Physically, Scherk-Schwarz theory describes a collection of massless photons (rather than gluons). As far as we know, this three-point vertex $\mathrm{Tr}(F^\nu_\mu F^\rho_\nu F^\mu_\rho)$ first appeared in discussions of bosonic-string modifications of Yang-Mills theory made by Scherk and Schwarz [20]. Action Eq. (12) is named after them to commemorate this achievement. Then, it is straightforward to show that $\mathcal{A}_4^{(3)} = 0$ in $D = 4$, as $\mathcal{A}_{\rm YM}^{(3)}$ is non-vanishing only for $(-,-,+)$ and $(+,+,-)$, while $\mathcal{A}_{\rm SS}^{(3)}$ is non-vanishing only for $(-,-,-)$ and $(+,+,+)$. Higher-point amplitudes could be calculated by Feynman diagrams, and it turns out that they vanish for all possible helicity configurations. This is, in fact, an immediate consequence of the fact that $[\sqrt{-g}(R^2 - 4R^{\mu\nu}R_{\mu\nu} + R^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}R_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma})]^{(3)}$ is a total derivative in $D = 4$, and cannot give rise to non-vanishing matrix elements.

On the other hand, $S_6^{(3)}$ could indeed give rise to nontrivial scattering amplitudes in $D = 4$. Similarly, for three-point amplitude one has

$$\mathcal{A}_6^{(3)} = \mathcal{A}_{\rm SS}^{(3)} \times \mathcal{A}_{\rm SS}^{(3)}.$$

which is non-vanishing for $(-,-,-)$ and $(+,+,+)$ only. Explicitly, we have

$$\mathcal{A}_6^{(3)}(1^-,2^-,3^-) = \left(\langle 12\rangle \langle 23\rangle \langle 31\rangle\right)^2, \quad \mathcal{A}_6^{(3)}(1^+,2^+,3^+) = \left([12][23][31]\right)^2$$

The four-point amplitudes could be obtained by Feynman diagrammatic calculations, and non-vanishing amplitudes (up to parity conjugations and cyclic permutations) are listed as follows:

$$\mathcal{A}_6^{(4)}(1^-,2^-,3^+,4^+) = \frac{\langle 12\rangle \langle 13\rangle \langle 14\rangle \langle 23\rangle \langle 24\rangle [43]^6}{[12]},$$

$$\mathcal{A}_6^{(4)}(1^-,2^+,3^-,4^+) = \frac{\langle 12\rangle \langle 13\rangle \langle 14\rangle \langle 23\rangle \langle 34\rangle [42]^6}{[31]},$$

$$\mathcal{A}_6^{(4)}(1^-,2^-,3^-,4^-) = -\frac{2}{s_{13}^3}\Bigg\{\frac{s_{12}(s_{12}^4+s_{12}^3 s_{13}-3s_{12}^2 s_{13}^2-7s_{12}s_{13}^3-3s_{13}^4)}{s_{12}+s_{13}}\langle 14\rangle^4\langle 23\rangle^4$$
$$+(4s_{12}^4+s_{12}^3 s_{13}-10s_{12}^2 s_{13}^2-19s_{12}s_{13}^3-8s_{13}^4)\langle 12\rangle\langle 14\rangle^3\langle 23\rangle^3\langle 34\rangle$$
$$+\frac{(s_{12}+s_{13})(6s_{12}^4-3s_{12}^3 s_{13}-10s_{12}^2 s_{13}^2-16s_{12}s_{13}^3-s_{13}^4)}{s_{12}}\langle 12\rangle^2\langle 14\rangle^2\langle 23\rangle^2\langle 34\rangle^2$$
$$+\frac{4s_{12}^6+3s_{12}^5 s_{13}-8s_{12}^4 s_{13}^2-19s_{12}^3 s_{13}^3-14s_{12}^2 s_{13}^4+s_{13}^6}{s_{12}^2}\langle 12\rangle^3\langle 14\rangle\langle 23\rangle\langle 34\rangle^3$$
$$+\frac{(s_{12}+s_{13})(s_{12}^6-2s_{12}^4 s_{13}^2-6s_{12}^3 s_{13}^3-3s_{12}^2 s_{13}^4+s_{13}^6)}{s_{12}^3}\langle 12\rangle^4\langle 34\rangle^4\Bigg\}.$$

The large z behavior of four-point amplitudes under Britto-Cachazo-Feng-Witten (BCFW) shift [21, 22]

$$|i\rangle \to |\hat{i}\rangle \equiv |i\rangle - z\,|j\rangle\,, \qquad |j] \to |\check{j}] \equiv |j] + z|i] \tag{13}$$

is then given by

$$\mathcal{A}_6^{(4)}(\hat{1}^-,2^-,\check{3}^+,4^+),\ \mathcal{A}_6^{(4)}(\hat{1}^-,2^-,3^+,\check{4}^+),\ \mathcal{A}_6^{(4)}(1^-,\hat{2}^-,\check{3}^+,4^+),\ \mathcal{A}_6^{(4)}(1^-,\hat{2}^-,3^+,\check{4}^+) \sim z^8,$$
$$\mathcal{A}_6^{(4)}(\hat{1}^-,\check{2}^-,3^+,4^+),\ \mathcal{A}_6^{(4)}(\check{1}^-,\hat{2}^-,3^+,4^+),\ \mathcal{A}_6^{(4)}(1^-,2^-,\hat{3}^+,\check{4}^+),\ \mathcal{A}_6^{(4)}(1^-,2^-,\check{3}^+,\hat{4}^+) \sim z^2,$$
$$\mathcal{A}_6^{(4)}(\check{1}^-,2^-,\hat{3}^+,4^+),\ \mathcal{A}_6^{(4)}(1^-,\check{2}^-,\hat{3}^+,4^+),\ \mathcal{A}_6^{(4)}(\check{1}^-,2^-,3^+,\hat{4}^+),\ \mathcal{A}_6^{(4)}(1^-,\check{2}^-,3^+,\hat{4}^+) \sim z^0;$$
$$\mathcal{A}_6^{(4)}(\hat{1}^-,\check{2}^+,3^-,4^+),\ \mathcal{A}_6^{(4)}(\hat{1}^-,2^+,3^-,\check{4}^+),\ \mathcal{A}_6^{(4)}(1^-,\check{2}^+,\hat{3}^-,4^+),\ \mathcal{A}_6^{(4)}(1^-,2^+,\hat{3}^-,\check{4}^+) \sim z^8,$$
$$\mathcal{A}_6^{(4)}(\hat{1}^-,2^+,\check{3}^-,4^+),\ \mathcal{A}_6^{(4)}(1^-,\hat{2}^+,3^-,\check{4}^+),\ \mathcal{A}_6^{(4)}(\check{1}^-,2^+,\hat{3}^-,4^+),\ \mathcal{A}_6^{(4)}(1^-,\check{2}^+,3^-,\hat{4}^+) \sim z^2,$$
$$\mathcal{A}_6^{(4)}(\check{1}^-,\hat{2}^+,3^-,4^+),\ \mathcal{A}_6^{(4)}(1^-,\hat{2}^+,\check{3}^-,4^+),\ \mathcal{A}_6^{(4)}(\check{1}^-,2^+,3^-,\hat{4}^+),\ \mathcal{A}_6^{(4)}(1^-,2^+,\check{3}^-,\hat{4}^+) \sim z^0;$$
$$\mathcal{A}_6^{(4)}(\hat{1}^-,\check{2}^-,3^-,4^-),\ \mathcal{A}_6^{(4)}(\hat{1}^-,2^-,\check{3}^-,4^-),\ \cdots \sim z^4, \qquad \text{for all BCFW pairs.}$$

Several remarks:

1. The BCFW deformations of all non-vanishing four-point amplitudes $\mathcal{A}_6^{(4)}$ do not vanish in the large z limit. As a result, the $S_6^{(3)}$ theory is not BCFW constructible [23], and four-point amplitudes $\mathcal{A}_6^{(4)}$ cannot be constructed by gluing solely various copies of on-shell three-point functions $\mathcal{A}_6^{(3)}$. This is different from Einstein's gravity, which is, in contrast, BCFW constructible [24, 25]. Generally, for BCFW inconstructible theories the on-shell recursion relations can be systematically written as

$$\mathcal{A}^{(n)}(0) = \sum_k \frac{\mathcal{A}_L(z_k)\times\mathcal{A}_R(z_k)}{P_k^2(0)} + C_0, \tag{14}$$

where k is some subset of the n momenta. Aside from the standard on-shell recursive contributions from gluing various copies of lower-point amplitudes, we have to take into considerations the extra boundary contribution C_0 to obtain correct results;

2. It is, at the first sight, quite surprising that $\mathcal{A}_6^{(4)}(1^-,2^-,3^-,4^-)\neq 0$ in the $S_6^{(3)}$ theory, as the naive analysis of the helicity structure of the three-point amplitudes

$\mathcal{A}_6^{(3)}$ would show that there is no contribution from on-shell recursions! In other words, $\mathcal{A}_6^{(4)}(1^-,2^-,3^-,4^-)$ receives only the boundary contribution C_0, which is different from BCFW constructible theories like Yang-Mills theory and Einstein's gravity, where non-vanishing amplitudes receive contributions merely from on-shell recursions, as well as $\mathcal{A}_6^{(4)}(1^-,2^-,3^+,4^+)$ and $\mathcal{A}_6^{(4)}(1^-,2^+,3^-,4^+)$, which receive contributions from both on-shell recursions and the boundary. Similarly, it is straightforward to show that in Scherk-Schwarz theory the color-ordered 4-point amplitude $\mathcal{A}_{\rm SS}^{(4)}(1^-,2^-,3^-,4^-)$ is also nonzero. It is interesting to study further the properties of scattering amplitudes that receive contributions merely from the boundary.

Non-Renormalization

In this section, we shall discuss first the non-renormalization theorem for pure special gravity, i.e., quantum mechanical loops cannot correct the $S_4^{(3)}$ and $S_6^{(3)}$ vertices. This could be proved using power counting, similar to proofs for non-renormalization theorems of Galileons, Einstein's gravity, $P(X)$ theories and conformal dilatons (see Ref. [26] for a recent discussion on these non-renormalization theorems).

For the $S_4^{(3)}$ theory in $D>4$, the momentum dependence of an n-point scattering amplitude $\mathcal{A}_4^{(n)}$ can be easily estimated as follows. Every loop integral leads to an integration $\sim\int \mathrm{d}^D k$, every internal line contributes $\sim\frac{1}{k^2}$, and each copy of $S_4^{(3)}$ vertices contributes $\sim k^4$. Denoting the number of loops in the target Feynman diagram as L, the number of internal lines by I, and the number of copies of $S_4^{(3)}$ vertices by $V_4^{(3)}$, we find that the n-point amplitude $\mathcal{A}_4^{(n)}$ scales as $\sim k^{DL-2I+4V_4^{(3)}}$. This result can be simplified further using simple graph-theoretical identities,

$$n+2I=3V_4^{(3)},\qquad L=1+I-V_4^{(3)},$$

and we have

$$\mathcal{A}_4^{(n)}\sim k^{(D+2)L+2n-2}. \tag{15}$$

In the above derivations, we have implicitly used dimensional regularization or some other mass-independent regularization schemes in loop calculations. This is quite important for the validity of our non-renormalization theorems. Also, the power counting results should be thought of as potentially containing logarithmic factors $\sim\log(k^2/\mu^2)$, with μ the regularization scale. As a result, it is straightforward to show that the $S_4^{(3)}$ vertices cannot be renormalized by loop corrections, as loop corrections with $L\geq 1$ instead renormalize multi-point vertices with derivatives $\geq D+6$.

Similarly, for the $S_6^{(3)}$ theory in $D\geq 4$, we have

$$\mathcal{A}_6^{(n)}\sim k^{(D+6)L+4n-6}, \tag{16}$$

which means that loop corrections with $L \geq 1$ renormalize multi-point vertices with derivatives $\geq D + 12$. As a result, the $S_6^{(3)}$ vertices cannot be renormalized by loop corrections.

Besides the $S_4^{(3)}$ and $S_6^{(3)}$ theory, it could be shown further that pure special gravity with both $S_4^{(3)}$ and $S_6^{(3)}$ vertices also shares non-renormalization of the same type. For special gravity coupling to matter fields, we have found that in many cases there also exist similar non-renormalization theorems, thanks to the higher-derivative nature of various interacting vertices.

Coupling with Matter and Massive Gravity

Although seemingly irrelevant at first sight, massive gravity, which aims to describe interactions of *massive* gravitons, turns out to be closely related to special gravity, which, in contrast, describes interactions of massless gravitons. To be specific, the so-called decoupling limit of massive gravity provides an example of matter coupled with special gravity.

Take the de Rham-Gabadadze-Tolley (dRGT) theory [27,28] as an example, which is the most popular ghost-free theory for massive gravity in $D = 4$ (see also Ref. [29] and [30] for comprehensive reviews). At intermediate energy scales depicted by the Λ_3-decoupling limit[5], the interactions between the helicity-2 and helicity-0 components could be described effectively by

$$S_{\Lambda_3} = \int \mathrm{d}^4x \left[-\frac{1}{2} h^{\mu\nu} \hat{\xi}^{\alpha\beta}_{\mu\nu} h_{\alpha\beta} + h_{\mu\nu} \left(X^{(1)}_{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{\Lambda_3^3} X^{(2)}_{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{\Lambda_3^6} X^{(3)}_{\mu\nu} \right) \right]. \tag{17}$$

Here $\hat{\xi}^{\alpha\beta}_{\mu\nu}$ is the Einstein operator, and the first term denotes the quadratic parts of Einstein-Hilbert action. And $X^{(n)}_{\mu\nu}$s are given by

$$X^{(1)}_{\mu\nu} \equiv \varepsilon_\mu{}^{\alpha\rho\sigma} \varepsilon_\nu{}^{\beta}{}_{\rho\sigma} \Pi_{\alpha\beta}, \quad X^{(2)}_{\mu\nu} \equiv \varepsilon_\mu{}^{\alpha\rho\gamma} \varepsilon_\nu{}^{\beta\sigma}{}_{\gamma} \Pi_{\alpha\beta} \Pi_{\rho\sigma}, \quad X^{(3)}_{\mu\nu} \equiv \varepsilon_\mu{}^{\alpha\rho\gamma} \varepsilon_\nu{}^{\beta\sigma\delta} \Pi_{\alpha\beta} \Pi_{\rho\sigma} \Pi_{\gamma\delta},$$

with $\Pi_{\alpha\beta} \equiv \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta \pi$. The scalar field π is introduced as the helicity-0 component of massive graviton, which turns out to be the Galileon field obeying the Galileon shift symmetry $\pi \to \pi + b^\mu x_\mu + c$ [27]. It is straightforward to show that the action S_{Λ_3} is invariant under gauge transformations, thanks to the amazing off-shell equality

$$\partial^\mu X^{(n)}_{\mu\nu} \equiv 0, \tag{18}$$

No additional steps are needed to make it consistent, in contrast with the already textbookified procedure of growing Einstein's gravity out of the first-order coupling

[5]Technically, the Λ_3-decoupling limit is defined as $m \to 0$, $M_{\rm Pl} \to \infty$, keeping $\Lambda_3 \equiv (m^2 M_{\rm Pl})^{1/3}$ fixed, with $M_{\rm Pl}$ the Planck scale, m the graviton mass. The intermediate energy scales E are required to satisfy $m \ll E \ll \Lambda_3 \ll M_{\rm Pl}$.

$h_{\mu\nu}T^{\mu\nu}$, where it is usually argued that this term once added destroys the conservation of $T^{\mu\nu}$ itself and thus additional terms are needed to make the theory consistent. This procedure is done infinitely many times and reproduces Einstein's gravity (or only several times in the Palatini language).

Thus, the S_{Λ_3} theory is a specific form of consistent couplings between special gravitons and scalar particles. Many aspects of the S_{Λ_3} theory, especially the non-renormalization theorem, have already been studied in details in Ref. [8], although the motivations are not the same as ours.

It is fair to say that the connection between massive gravity and special gravity have not been widely appreciated in literature yet (see Ref. [9] for an interesting exception). The most important implication of this connection, in our viewpoint, is that some version of special gravity could indeed provide an effective description of the macroscopic world, considering the fact that there are various phenomenological motivations for massive gravitons, such as the observation of the accelerating universe. This acts as one of the phenomenological motivations for studies of special gravity, besides the theoretical bias mentioned in the Introduction.

Emergent Gravitons

In this section, we would like to make a short discussion on some general aspects of special gravity and emergent gravitons in non-relativistic condensed matter systems.

It has been known for some time that there could be emergent massless graviton excitations in the low-energy spectrum of various condensed matter systems, such as the $4D$ quantum hall system [32] (see Ref. [33–35] for experimental proposals), qubit models [36] and quantum nematic crystals [37]. Naturally, one would try to ask further *what effective field theory describes interactions of these emergent gravitons*. The conventional guess is Einstein's gravity. However, we would like to stress that this is by no means an established physical fact, but just theoretical prejudice based on so-called "proofs" of the uniqueness of Einstein's gravity as the only consistent theories for interacting massless gravitons. In fact, there are strong theoretical reasons against taking Einstein's gravity, or its general covariant modifications, as a potential candidate.

It has been recognized for a long time that there are no local observables in Einstein's gravity as well as its general covariant modifications (see, e.g., [38–40]). This puts stringent constraints on the emergence of Einstein's gravity from condensed matter systems, which, in contrast, often do have local observables. This obstruction could also be appreciated from the holographic principle, which states that in Einstein's gravity the maximum entropy in a given volume is proportional to the surface

area. If there is indeed an underlying condensed matter system, one would expect the maximum entropy to be proportional to the volume instead, a contradiction.

With the above considerations, we propose instead special gravity as the correct answer. Contrary to Einstein's gravity, special gravity evades the above no-go arguments, thanks to the fact that it is invariant under only gauge symmetry rather than general covariance and thus there could be local observables. Considering the above arguments against Einstein's gravity, special gravity seems to be theoretically preferred, if there are indeed interactions among emergent gravitons and other excitations of the system. In other words, condensed matter systems may provide extra physical playgrounds for special gravity, besides massive gravity. A detailed study of this possibility will be presented in a forthcoming work [41].

Summary

In this note, we have studied various properties of special gravity, a novel class of gauge invariant theories for interacting massless gravitons. Explicitly, we have studied the construction of suitable Lagrangians, asymptotic causality in special gravity, scattering amplitudes for massless gravitons, non-renormalization theorems, and connections between special gravity and massive gravity, as well as emergent gravitons in condensed matter systems.

Besides open questions scattered in above sections, we would like to end this note with some further remarks:

First, it would be interesting to study possible supersymmetrizations of special gravity. It is known in literature [10] that the three-point amplitude $\mathcal{A}_6^{(3)}$ is incompatible with supersymmetry. As a result, the $S_6^{(3)}$ theory could not be supersymmetrized. Also, $\mathcal{A}_4^{(3)}$ is incompatible with maximal supersymmetry, but could indeed be compatible with half maximal supersymmetry. But the explicit form of supersymmetric $S_4^{(3)}$ theory has not been worked out yet;

Second, it would be interesting to understand in more details of scattering amplitudes in the $S_6^{(3)}$ theory. It is not clear to us yet whether there are closed general formula for at least some specific n-point amplitudes, or whether there is a recursive formulation to build up higher-point amplitudes from lower-point amplitudes, which could be used for practical calculations. Moreover, it is shown in Ref. [42] that the R^3 modification of Einstein's gravity could be constructed from double copies of the F^3 modification of Yang-Mills theory (See Ref. [43] for a recent discussion on this issue from the viewpoint of Cachazo-He-Yuan formalism [44, 45]). Although closely related, the technical problem we are attacking in the context of special gravity is a bit different, and it is not clear whether special gravity shares similar properties.

We shall come back to these issues in future publications.

Acknowledgement

We would like to thank Zhao-Long Gu, Song He, and Yue Huang for helpful discussions. In this work, we have used the Mathematica packages xTras [46], FeynRules [47], FeynArts [48], FormCalc [49], S@M [50] for symbolic calculations.

Appendix

Here we give a formal demonstration of why the $(n+1)$-th order expansion of n-th Lovelock term around Minkowski background is invariant up to total derivatives under (linear) gauge transformation. This is already mentioned by K. Hinterbichler [9] as "pseudo-linear" theories. The starting point is usual general covariance.

Now consider the expansion of the action around an arbitrary background $g_{\mu\nu} = \epsilon h_{\mu\nu} + f_{\mu\nu}$, namely

$$S[\epsilon h + f] = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \epsilon^i S_f^{(i)}[h]. \tag{19}$$

Every $S_f^{(i)}$ is a symmetric i-tic form $S_f^{(i)}[h, h, \ldots, h]$ on the linear space of all h configurations.

Now let's expand the general coordinate transformation. Consider $\phi_{\epsilon X}$, the 1-parameter diffeomorphism subgroup generated by a vector field X^μ and parametrized by ϵ, so that X and h are of the same order.

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi_{\epsilon X}^* g &= \exp[\epsilon \pounds_X](\epsilon h + f) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{\epsilon^i}{i!} (\pounds_X)^i (\epsilon h + f) \\
&= f + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\epsilon^i}{(i-1)!} (\pounds_X)^{i-1} (h + \frac{1}{i} \pounds_X f) \\
&\equiv f + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \epsilon^i \tilde{h}^{(i)},
\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

where $\pounds_X$ denotes Lie derivative with respect to X. The first few orders of the gauge transformation looks like

$$\tilde{h}^{(1)} = h + \pounds_X f, \qquad \tilde{h}^{(2)} = \pounds_X (h + \frac{1}{2} \pounds_X f). \tag{21}$$

Now general covariance states that $S[\phi^* g] = S[g]$. When expanded perturbatively, it reads

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \epsilon^i S_f^{(i)}[h] = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \epsilon^i S_f^{(i)} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \epsilon^i \tilde{h}^{(i)} \right]. \tag{22}$$

Let's see what this dictates for the first few orders. Suppose the first non-vanishing positive order of the expansion is k, then

$$\epsilon^k : S_f^{(k)}[h] = S_f^{(k)}[\tilde{h}^{(1)}], \tag{23a}$$

$$\epsilon^{k+1} : S_f^{(k+1)}[h] = S_f^{(k+1)}[\tilde{h}^{(1)}] + kS_f^{(k)}[\tilde{h}^{(1)}, \tilde{h}^{(1)}, \ldots, \tilde{h}^{(2)}]. \tag{23b}$$

Note that $\tilde{h}^{(1)}$ is the (linear) gauge transformation that we are interested in. So the first non-vanishing order of the action is automatically (linear) gauge invariant, and the next to leading order is almost so apart from the addition of a term determined by a lower order in the expansion.

Let's examine the Lovelock terms (wrapped by spacetime integrals)

$$S_n = \int \mathrm{d}^D x \sqrt{-g}\ R_{[\mu_1\nu_1}{}^{\mu_1\nu_1} R_{\mu_2\nu_2}{}^{\mu_2\nu_2} \cdots R_{\mu_n\nu_n]}{}^{\mu_n\nu_n}, \tag{24}$$

around Minkowski spacetime ($f = \eta$) $R_{\mu\nu}{}^{\rho\sigma}$ is $O(h)$, so the first non-vanishing order of S_n is n, being

$$S_{n|\eta}^{(n)}[h] = 2^n \int \mathrm{d}^D x\, \partial_{[\mu_1}\partial^{\mu_1} h_{\nu_1}^{\nu_1} \partial_{\mu_2}\partial^{\mu_2} h_{\nu_2}^{\nu_2} \cdots \partial_{\mu_n}\partial^{\mu_n} h_{\nu_n]}^{\nu_n}, \tag{25}$$

which accidentally is an integral of a total derivative, or to put more precisely, any expression of the form $S_{n|\eta}^{(n)}[h_1, h_2, \ldots, h_n]$ is an integral of a total derivative. This makes the last term of (23b) vanish, making the next to leading order expansion $S_{n|\eta}^{(n+1)}[h]$ a (linear) gauge invariant term.

However, on non-trivial backgrounds, $R_{\mu\nu}{}^{\rho\sigma}$ acquires non-vanishing background value, and thus $S_{n|\eta}^{(n)}[h]$ is non-vanishing at every order of the perturbative expansion. As a result, the pseudo-linear construction fails on non-trivial backgrounds.

This method could also be used to construct gauge invariant couplings with matter. We start with a generally covariant term whose first few orders in $h_{\mu\nu}$ vanish on Minkowski, say let's take $\sqrt{-g}R\phi^2$, $\sqrt{-g}\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{GB}}\phi^2$, the former gives the $h^{\mu\nu}X_{\mu\nu}^{(1)}$ term upon expanding first order in $h_{\mu\nu}$ then integrating by parts, while the latter upon expanding second order in $h_{\mu\nu}$ gives another gauge invariant coupling vertex which has 2 $h_{\mu\nu}$ legs.

References

[1] R. M. Wald, "Spin-2 Fields and General Covariance," Phys. Rev. D **33**, 3613 (1986).

[2] C. Cutler and R. M. Wald, "A New Type of Gauge Invariance for a Collection of Massless Spin-2 Fields. 1. Existence and Uniqueness," Class. Quant. Grav. **4**, 1267 (1987).

[3] R. M. Wald, "A New Type of Gauge Invariance for a Collection of Massless Spin-2 Fields. 2. Geometrical Interpretation," Class. Quant. Grav. **4**, 1279 (1987).

[4] K. Heiderich and W. Unruh, "Spin-2 Fields, General Covariance, and Conformal Invariance," Phys. Rev. D **38**, 490 (1988).

[5] K. R. Heiderich and W. G. Unruh, "Nonlinear, noncovariant spin two theories," Phys. Rev. D **42**, 2057 (1990).

[6] N. Boulanger, T. Damour, L. Gualtieri and M. Henneaux, "Inconsistency of interacting, multigraviton theories," Nucl. Phys. B **597**, 127 (2001) [hep-th/0007220].

[7] P. Horava and C. M. Melby-Thompson, "General Covariance in Quantum Gravity at a Lifshitz Point," Phys. Rev. D **82**, 064027 (2010) [arXiv:1007.2410 [hep-th]].

[8] C. de Rham, G. Gabadadze, L. Heisenberg and D. Pirtskhalava, "Nonrenormalization and naturalness in a class of scalar-tensor theories," Phys. Rev. D **87**, no. 8, 085017 (2013) [arXiv:1212.4128].

[9] K. Hinterbichler, "Ghost-Free Derivative Interactions for a Massive Graviton," JHEP **1310**, 102 (2013) [arXiv:1305.7227 [hep-th]].

[10] X. O. Camanho, J. D. Edelstein, J. Maldacena and A. Zhiboedov, "Causality Constraints on Corrections to the Graviton Three-Point Coupling," JHEP **1602**, 020 (2016) [arXiv:1407.5597 [hep-th]].

[11] R. R. Metsaev and A. A. Tseytlin, "Curvature Cubed Terms in String Theory Effective Actions," Phys. Lett. B **185**, 52 (1987).

[12] D. Lovelock, "The Einstein tensor and its generalizations," J. Math. Phys. **12**, 498 (1971).

[13] D. Lovelock, "The four-dimensionality of space and the einstein tensor," J. Math. Phys. **13**, 874 (1972).

[14] I. I. Shapiro, "Fourth Test of General Relativity," Phys. Rev. Lett. **13**, 789 (1964).

[15] S. Gao and R. M. Wald, "Theorems on gravitational time delay and related issues," Class. Quant. Grav. **17**, 4999 (2000) [gr-qc/0007021].

[16] S. Deser, Gen. Rel. Grav. **1**, 9 (1970) doi:10.1007/BF00759198 [gr-qc/0411023].

[17] S. Deser, "Gravity From Selfinteraction in a Curved Background," Class. Quant. Grav. **4**, L99 (1987).

[18] T. Padmanabhan, "From gravitons to gravity: Myths and reality," Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **17**, 367 (2008) [gr-qc/0409089].

[19] S. Deser, "Gravity from self-interaction redux," Gen. Rel. Grav. **42**, 641 (2010) [arXiv:0910.2975 [gr-qc]].

[20] J. Scherk and J. H. Schwarz, "Dual Models for Nonhadrons," Nucl. Phys. B **81**, 118 (1974).

[21] R. Britto, F. Cachazo and B. Feng, "New recursion relations for tree amplitudes of gluons," Nucl. Phys. B **715**, 499 (2005) [hep-th/0412308].

[22] R. Britto, F. Cachazo, B. Feng and E. Witten, "Direct proof of tree-level recursion relation in Yang-Mills theory," Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 181602 (2005) [hep-th/0501052].

[23] P. Benincasa and F. Cachazo, "Consistency Conditions on the S-Matrix of Massless Particles," arXiv:0705.4305 [hep-th].

[24] F. Cachazo and P. Svrcek, "Tree level recursion relations in general relativity," hep-th/0502160.

[25] P. Benincasa, C. Boucher-Veronneau and F. Cachazo, "Taming Tree Amplitudes In General Relativity," JHEP **0711**, 057 (2007) [hep-th/0702032 [hep-th]].

[26] G. Goon, K. Hinterbichler, A. Joyce and M. Trodden, "Aspects of Galileon Non-Renormalization," arXiv:1606.02295 [hep-th].

[27] C. de Rham and G. Gabadadze, "Generalization of the Fierz-Pauli Action," Phys. Rev. D **82**, 044020 (2010) [arXiv:1007.0443 [hep-th]].

[28] C. de Rham, G. Gabadadze and A. J. Tolley, "Resummation of Massive Gravity," Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 231101 (2011) [arXiv:1011.1232 [hep-th]].

[29] K. Hinterbichler, "Theoretical Aspects of Massive Gravity," Rev. Mod. Phys. **84**, 671 (2012) [arXiv:1105.3735 [hep-th]].

[30] C. de Rham, "Massive Gravity," Living Rev. Rel. **17**, 7 (2014) [arXiv:1401.4173 [hep-th]].

[31] S. Weinberg and E. Witten, "Limits on Massless Particles," Phys. Lett. B **96**, 59 (1980).

[32] S. C. Zhang and J. P. Hu, "A Four-dimensional generalization of the quantum Hall effect," Science **294**, 823 (2001) [cond-mat/0110572].

[33] Y. E. Kraus, Z. Ringel, and O. Zilberberg, "Four-Dimensional Quantum Hall Effect in a Two-Dimensional Quasicrystal" Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 226401 (2013) [arXiv:1302.2647 [cond-mat.mes-hall]].

[34] H. M. Price, O. Zilberberg, T. Ozawa, I. Carusotto, and N. Goldman, "Four-Dimensional Quantum Hall Effect with Ultracold Atoms," Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 195303 (2015) [arXiv:1505.04387 [cond-mat.quant-gas]].

[35] T. Ozawa, H. M. Price, N. Goldman, O. Zilberberg and I. Carusotto, "Synthetic dimensions in integrated photonics: From optical isolation to four-dimensional quantum Hall physics," Phys. Rev. A **93**, no. 4, 043827 (2016).

[36] Z. C. Gu and X. G. Wen, "Emergence of helicity +- 2 modes (gravitons) from qubit models," Nucl. Phys. B **863**, 90 (2012) [arXiv:0907.1203 [gr-qc]].

[37] J. Zaanen and A. J. Beekman, "The Emergence of gauge invariance: The Stay-at-home gauge versus local-global duality," Annals Phys. **327**, 1146 (2012) [arXiv:1108.2791 [cond-mat.str-el]].

[38] S. Witten, "Emergent phenomena in condensed matter and particle physics." Alba Nova colloquium, April 2008.

[39] S. B. Giddings, "The gravitational S-matrix: Erice lectures," Subnucl. Ser. **48**, 93 (2013) [arXiv:1105.2036 [hep-th]].

[40] S. Carlip, "Challenges for Emergent Gravity," Stud. Hist. Phil. Sci. B **46**, 200 (2014) [arXiv:1207.2504 [gr-qc]].

[41] D. Bai, Z. L. Gu and Y. H. Xing, under preparation.

[42] J. Broedel and L. J. Dixon, "Color-kinematics duality and double-copy construction for amplitudes from higher-dimension operators," JHEP **1210**, 091 (2012) [arXiv:1208.0876 [hep-th]].

[43] S. He and Y. Zhang, "New Formulas for Amplitudes from Higher-Dimensional Operators," arXiv:1608.08448 [hep-th].

[44] F. Cachazo, S. He and E. Y. Yuan, "Scattering equations and Kawai-Lewellen-Tye orthogonality," Phys. Rev. D **90**, no. 6, 065001 (2014) [arXiv:1306.6575 [hep-th]].

[45] F. Cachazo, S. He and E. Y. Yuan, "Scattering of Massless Particles in Arbitrary Dimensions," Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, no. 17, 171601 (2014) [arXiv:1307.2199 [hep-th]].

[46] T. Nutma, "xTras : A field-theory inspired xAct package for mathematica," Comput. Phys. Commun. **185**, 1719 (2014) [arXiv:1308.3493 [cs.SC]].

[47] A. Alloul, N. D. Christensen, C. Degrande, C. Duhr and B. Fuks, "FeynRules 2.0 - A complete toolbox for tree-level phenomenology," Comput. Phys. Commun. **185**, 2250 (2014) [arXiv:1310.1921 [hep-ph]].

[48] T. Hahn, "Generating Feynman diagrams and amplitudes with FeynArts 3," Comput. Phys. Commun. **140**, 418 (2001) [hep-ph/0012260].

[49] C. Gro, T. Hahn, S. Heinemeyer, F. von der Pahlen, H. Rzehak and C. Schappacher, "New Developments in FormCalc 8.4," PoS LL **2014**, 035 (2014) [arXiv:1407.0235 [hep-ph]].

[50] D. Maitre and P. Mastrolia, "S@M, a Mathematica Implementation of the Spinor-Helicity Formalism," Comput. Phys. Commun. **179**, 501 (2008) [arXiv:0710.5559 [hep-ph]].